

See 3

# CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 36, NO. 9

December 14, 1942

WHOLE NO. 960

TOWN MEETING DISCUSSES WARTIME NEED  
OF CLASSICS (Levine)

## REVIEWS

GLOVER, Challenge of the Greek (*Scott*); HYATT, Treatment of Final Vowels in Early Neo-Babylonian (*Jacobsen*); GRAY, Hegel's Hellenic Ideal (*Solmsen*); STOESSL, Apollonios Rhodios (*Heller*); SACKS, Latinity of Dated Documents in the Portuguese Territory (*Deferrari*)

## ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

---

---

### The Student's

## OXFORD ARISTOTLE

Translated into English under the editorship of  
**W. D. ROSS**

This edition, which is a selection from the monumental eleven-volume Oxford *Works of Aristotle*, contains those works in their entirety which are of central importance to an understanding of Aristotle's philosophy. Each volume has an index, and the series includes a new introduction, preface and bibliography by Sir David Ross. 6 volumes \*\$7.50 the set

Sold separately:      Vol. I, \*\$1.50      Vol. III, \*\$1.00      Vol. V, \*\$1.00  
   II, \*\$2.00      IV, \*\$1.00      VI, \*\$1.50

**OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS**  
114 Fifth Avenue      New York

---

---



# CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (each Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-five issues.

Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

James Stinchcomb, Editor, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

John F. Gummere, Secretary and Treasurer, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Contributing Editors: Lionel Casson, Jotham Johnson, Eugene W. Miller, Charles T. Murphy, J. C. Plumpe, Bluma L. Trell.

Price, \$2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price.

Entered as second-class matter October 14, 1938, at the post office at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 36 contains issues dated: October 5, 12, 19, 26; November 2, 16, 30; December 7, 14 (1942); January 11, 18, 25; February 8, 15; March 1, 8, 15, 22, 29; April 5, 12; May 10, 17, 24; June 7 (1943).

---

## COMING ATTRACTIONS

### DECEMBER 27 Bryn Mawr College

Business Meeting, Directors of American Philological Association, in lieu of cancelled Cincinnati sessions

### DECEMBER 30-31 Metropolitan Museum of Art

ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA

President: Professor William B. Dinsmoor, Columbia University

Vice-President: Professor Rhys Carpenter, Bryn Mawr College

Secretary: Professor Meriwether Stuart, Hunter College

#### PROGRAM

Wednesday Morning, Committee Meetings

### Wednesday 2 P.M. Etruscan Symposium

Participating: David Randall-MacIver, Mrs. Edith Hall Dohan, George M. A. Hanfmann, Prentice Duell, H. M. Hoenigswald

### Wednesday 7:30 P.M. Dinner Meeting

President's Address: The Antecedents and the Heroic Age of the Institute

### Thursday 9:30 A.M. Papers

Robert Scranton, C. A. Robinson, Jr., Ambrose Lansing, Hugh O. Hencken, Erling C. Olsen, Oscar Broneer, David M. Robinson

Local Committee Chairman: Dr. Gisela M. A. Richter

---

## TOWN MEETING DISCUSSES WARTIME NEED OF CLASSICS

Thanksgiving evening, November 26, America's Town Meeting of the Air radio program at Town Hall, New York City, presented "How Can Education Keep Pace with War Needs?" This discussion was sponsored jointly by Town Hall, under the able guidance of its moderator, Mr. George V. Denny, Jr., and the National Council for Social Studies. As speakers who had worthy plans and ideas, Mr. Denny chose Dr. John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education, Dr. Stringfellow Barr, President of St. John's College, Annapolis, and Dr. Mary B. Gilson, an adviser to the Manpower Commission and Professor Emeritus of Economics at the University of Chicago.

It was significant that Mr. Denny opened the program with the words which Thucydides puts into the mouth of Pericles in his Funeral Oration, words which take on added meaning when applied to so controversial a subject as the one discussed.

Dr. Studebaker then outlined a plan for the complete conversion of American education, from kindergarten to college, in order to meet the manpower needs of a nation at war. In this program, Dr. Studebaker asserted, our high schools should provide an accelerated physical training schedule, concentrated scientific and mathematical training, and specialized pre-induction courses for young men. He then listed some specific subjects of this curriculum: pre-flight aeronautics, fundamentals of electricity, radio and automotive mechanics, and practical shop courses. The liberal arts, Dr. Studebaker said, must be given a far less prominent position in our schools. The one and only cry should be the immediate preparation of all able-bodied young men and women for work necessary for a speedy, complete victory. However, he agreed that all students should be taught the origins, problems and issues of the war, so that each future worker might see and clearly understand his or her part in this effort.

President Barr expressed the strong belief that the schools, particularly colleges and universities, should not place supreme importance upon studies which Dr. Studebaker outlined in his program. Mr. Barr granted the vital need of proficient war workers, but he objected strenuously to Dr. Studebaker's plan of placing the liberal arts on the proverbial shelf for the duration. Mr. Barr emphasized his belief that the greatest and most perilous need of our schools at present was to produce men and women who could think and reason clearly. He would impart to the future soldier or war worker a few pages of history and culture; he would immerse their minds and hearts in the wellsprings of our accumulated knowledge; and, most important of all, he would be sure that the future citizen would know and comprehend our democratic way of life. Democratic ideals, culture, knowledge, these should have preference over such courses as Dr. Studebaker outlined. Mr. Barr was not without his statistics. From Army reports he quoted to the effect that many college-trained men could not analyze or interpret a paragraph of plain English. Reports from the Navy were similar: 68% of a total of 4200 college freshmen who applied for officers' training courses failed the arithmetical reasoning test. Here is being recorded the gradual breakdown of our system of education. Important to note is his firm belief that a democratic society cannot exist with ignorant citizenry. Culture and democracy are inextricably bound together, and one without the other is unthinkable.

Professor Gilson, like Dr. Studebaker and President Barr, began with the axiomatic statement that our schools must do everything in their power swiftly to insure complete victory. While tremendous forces, economic, social and political, were shaping the world to come, our teachers either were disinterested or refused to discuss these issues. Our students therefore had as complete a blackout in regard to vital questions as ever a Londoner experienced. She accused American teachers of avoiding controversial issues and refusing to take a stand for democracy in the last years before the war came to us. She blamed the timidity of teachers for the

"undue proportion of conscientious objectors" in the colleges, and suggested the instituting of a "system of adult education for re-educating the minds and emotions of the educators." Every student in our schools must be made aware that he is living in a changing social order and aware of the dangers of dictatorship, and he must be willing to give his own life, if necessary, in the defense of our democratic way of life. Hence we must have teachers who are unafraid to speak the truth, to discuss controversial issues, to bring ancient and mediaeval times up to the present. We must not abandon the classics or classical training, Dr. Gilson pointed out, but we must not make the mistake of teaching Humanism cloaked in her ancient garb of scholasticism. Humanists must be dynamic, alive to the issues of today as well as to those of yesterday. In no other way can a democratic society live.

Emerson, in his essay on War said: "The cause of peace is not the cause of cowardice. . . . If peace is to be maintained, it must be by brave men, who have come up to the same height as the hero. . . ." After the war and victory, there will be peace. Right now, as Professor Riess has suggested, the part of the classics can be only "insignificant." A whole new philosophy of classical education must come from this war. It is not enough to say that we shall again enjoy Latin and Greek after the hostilities cease. What we want to know is how and to what extent shall our teaching of Latin and Greek be altered. What, in other words, have we learned from this bitter struggle?

Dr. Gilson knows all this. So does Dr. Studebaker. Our institutions of freedom, of religion, are all the products of a culture which, as Dr. Gilson puts it, "is essentially the culture of Greece, inherited from the Greeks by the Romans, transfused with the religious teachings of Christianity, and progressively enlarged from the beginning of the Middle Ages up to the first third of the nineteenth century."

EMANUEL LEVINE

JERSEY CITY

## REVIEW

### **The Challenge of the Greek** and Other Essays.

By T. R. GLOVER. x, 231 pages, frontispiece. University Press, Cambridge; Macmillan, New York 1942 \$2.75

The book gets its title from a short address given over the B.B.C. in December 1935. The other essays are connected with the most varied and unrelated themes: Purpose in Classical Studies, Forests, Farming, Emporia, Feeding the Athenians, Fairy Tales, Iced Water, Team or Hero?, Homer and his Readers, Virgil, Erasmus.

The author has travelled widely, has studied many lands, and knows great areas of literature. In this book he shares with his readers some of his varied experiences and impressions. His touch is very light and even when he is lightly touching one feels that his eye is on something else.

Doctor Glover has little use for philology and the philologists: "It is life that really teaches, and it does not consist of minutiae, dates, various readings, grammatical rules and Grimm's Law" (23). "The curious thing is that some readers, with very slight hold on grammar—or with none at all, like John Keats—can achieve this" (appreciation of great literature) "while



the grammarian very often comes, in Plato's phrase, to the door of the Muses and goes away empty, though, by a kind dispensation of Providence, he doesn't know he is empty" (24).

Of the illustrious Sir Richard Jebb he writes: "Jebb always gave the impression that Sophocles was a book and not a man. Perhaps the trouble with Jebb was he was afraid of giving himself away, of betraying any real feeling, so he never gave himself away, never challenged his class to face anything big, but only looked at us out of the corners of his eyes. But you will never win disciples if you look at them sideways" (25).

It is no accident that among the vast number of names mentioned in this book and in the copious Index the names Bentley, Porson, Ellis, Monro and Farnell do not appear.

The basic idea of most of the essays is that like conditions produce like results in antiquity and today, that climate, winds, rivers, harbors, forests and rain had much the same influence then as now. Overhearing some commercial travellers praising Quebec as a place where goods can be sold, he studied the advantages of that city and from it drew conclusions for the economic greatness of Athens, Alexandria and Marseilles. This is the basis for the essay named *Emporia*. The lessons he learned from his great familiarity with the forests of Canada he applied to those of Greece, and he constantly draws interesting and conclusive parallels between the modern and the ancient world.

All the essays abound in side-remarks, indeed, side-remarks seem their purpose, and one would hardly search a book entitled *The Challenge of the Greek* for such useful information as any of the following: "Explorers as early as 1500 remarked that water from icebergs was fresh" (158); "The translators of the Bible were so careful in their work that there is no trace in the Bible's own pages of the florid elegance in the Dedication to King James" (216), an acute observation, but it is hidden in an essay on Homer and his Readers; "Economics is a branch of study which I gather has produced only one first class classic, and that was in the eighteenth century" (74); "India's most significant contribution to the West, the rat" (94); "Gooseberries and oranges must be promptly turned into jam and marmalade" (68); there seems some confusion here regarding oranges; "The horse in the British army is allowed twelve pounds of hay and twelve pounds of corn per day" (52); "It is computed that a man weighing 150 pounds wants 264 gallons of water to drink per annum" (49); this is not in my field, but I have assumed that men in hot climates drink more water than those in cold.

A reader is surprised to find in a book with this title a large reproduction of a Canadian poster with a warning in French and English not to throw burning matches or cigarettes from the train.

However the thing he could hardly expect is a complete chart of all the various vitamins and to learn from such a book that "Vitamin D prevents rickets" while "Vitamin E helps babies before birth."

These essays are very uneven; the short *Team or Hero?* is such a collection of quotations from Polybius, Aristotle, Pindar, Sophocles, Solon, Plato, Pausanias, Pericles, Herodotus, Thucydides, Epicurus, Pliny, Trajan, Tertullian, Justin Martyr, Tacitus, Diogenes Laertius, Athenaeus, Marcus Aurelius, Longinus, Constantine, Bagshot, Browning, Newbolt, William Wordsworth, Enid Welsford, Goethe, Froude, Carlyle, Matthew Arnold, James Adam, Mark Twain, Earp, Dudley, Ouida, Jane Austen, LaBruyère, Freeman, Thirlwall, Christopher Wordsworth, Gilbert Murray, the Gospels, Saint Paul, and Martin Luther that the baffled reader wonders whether he is reading an actual essay or a modern adaptation of Stobaeus.

The three essays, *The Greek and the Forest*, *The Greek Farmer*, and *Feeding the Athenians*, abound in useful and interesting information, showing keen observation of present conditions and wide as well as accurate knowledge of similar conditions in antiquity.

These three essays show the author at his best, a best any scholar might envy.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

**The Treatment of Final Vowels in Early Neo-Babylonian.** By JAMES PHILIP HYATT. ix, 59 pages. Yale University Press, New Haven 1941. Yale Oriental Series: Researches, Volume XXIII) \$2

It was noted early in the history of Assyriology that the Babylonian dialect of Akkadian in its later phases shows a tendency toward loss of final vowel. Precise observations were difficult to make, however, for this linguistic change had far-reaching repercussions in the script so that standard sign-values and orthographical rules of Cuneiform are not directly applicable to the texts documenting it. A key to what had happened was given by later Greek transliterations of Akkadian phrases, dating from the First Century B.C. but even with this help progress toward a reliable and precise delineation of the conditions which govern the treatment of final vowels in Neo-Babylonian has been slow. The position after the latest study of the problem (by Rimalt in 1934) was approximately as follows: Final vowel is generally lost; exceptions are foreign proper names and certain cases in which the final vowel serves as distinctive mark of a grammatical function, e.g., in most plural forms and second person singular feminine of the verb and in nominal forms with first person singular possessive suffix. As for the script the vowel of signs representing consonant + vowel is not read when the sign occurs final in a word. In the cases

where final vowel is intended the scribe indicates it by addition of the sign for the vowel in question or by the *UMUN* sign which can stand for any vowel.

The monograph under review—written as part of a doctor's thesis under Professors Goetze and Stephens—takes us an important step further. Based on a representative body of material Hyatt is able not only to confirm the orthographical results thus far reached but at the same time to show that preservation or loss of final vowel in Early Neo-Babylonian is largely dependent on the quantity and pitch of the vowel. Short vowels are regularly elided while long vowels with uneven pitch are regularly preserved. Only in the case of long vowel with even pitch do we find psychological causes at work: the tendency is toward elision but this development is retarded in certain forms where the final vowel serves as distinctive mark of the grammatical function, in the forms of plural masculine nouns ending in *-ē*—less regularly—in those verbal plurals which end in a vowel.

Hyatt's treatment of his material makes a favorable impression, his analysis is methodical and circumspect, his conclusions seem well-founded. Special mention should be accorded his translations which combine refreshing freedom of diction with precise rendering of the meaning conveyed by the Akkadian phrase. This high general level makes up for occasional lapses such as "May . . . cause his body to have dropsy which cannot be cured" for *a-ga-là-til-la-a še-rit-su šá la pa-ta-ru lu-šar-šeš*, 'May . . . let him get his unrelievable punishment, dropsy' on page 51, ". . . opposite us" for *a-na tar-ši a-ba-meš*, 'opposite each other' on page 47 or ". . . and I not believe (it)?" for *u a-na-ku a-qiq-pu-u* (misprint, correct to *a-qip-pu-u*), '. . . and whom I believe?' on page 54. On page 40 the forms following the numerals for 10 and 6 would more naturally find their place under Genitive than under Nominative Plural.

In the course of his investigation the author has occasion to touch on another well known problem of Neo-Babylonian phonetics, that of anaptyctic vowels. This problem has remained almost entirely uninvestigated in Assyriological literature and scholars still have to rely upon whatever accidental jottings they themselves may have made from time to time. Such material as the reviewer has noted—most of it late and regrettably incomplete—suggests the existence of a strong tendency for anaptyctic vowels to develop between any two adjoining consonants in a word or compound provided the second consonant is not a spirant. But only monographic treatment could bring clarity here. Hyatt restricts himself in the main to stating the problem and merely insofar as it touches directly that of the final vowels: ". . . in the case of words ending in two dissimilar consonants it is possible that a vowel (probably reduced in quantity) was pronounced between

the two consonants, although it was not usually written." In thus limiting himself to his immediate problem he is of course entirely justified, but one cannot but hope that he may find time and interest to extend the investigation thus broached. A companion volume on anaptyxis would render the field of Neo-Babylonian phonetics equally signal services.

THORKILD JACOBSEN

ORIENTAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

**Hegel's Hellenic Ideal.** By J. GLENN GRAY. viii, 104 pages. King's Crown Press, New York 1941 \$1.50

Mr. Gray deals with one of the more pleasant phases of Hegel's thought. His subject comes under the general headings of Hegel as Historian, Hegel's Interpretation of History, and Philosophy and History in Hegel. Before Hegel the study of history had been a cultural luxury; he made it a cultural necessity by showing that historical evolution is not an adjunct of intellectual life, but its soul and essence. And while he was not the first to raise the fundamental questions as to the meaning and mechanism, direction and goal of 'universal history' he was the first whose rational system of history shows a real balance between the historical and the rational factor.

But if Hegel gave philosophical interpretations of history there arises the question: Have his interpretations merely philosophical or also historical significance? Did he have glimpses of genuine historical insight and did he make discoveries which are valid even today and which, if not just what one would call 'the last word' on a subject, are yet suggestive and stimulating even for the twentieth-century historian and classicist? Mr. Gray answers this question emphatically in the affirmative. He is ready to abandon the general scheme and pattern into which Hegel forced the historical process (and which ever since his own time has discredited the whole system), but would find all the more value in his specific insights and discoveries, most particularly in those concerning the fundamental differences between the Greek mind and the modern mind. He might have added that it is precisely through this wealth of specific and truly historical intuitions that Hegel's constructive picture of history contrasts favorably with those which are nowadays in vogue. For, while the generalizations which confront us in Spengler and Macmurray or in our contemporary Marxians and Kierkegaardians are just as speculative and—at least—just as sweeping as Hegel's, they lack the redeeming feature of stirring and fertile insights into the characteristics of a historical subject or period.

Mr. Gray follows the course of Hegel's own intellectual growth. He takes his starting point in those

Jugendschriften and early diaries whose importance was stressed by Dilthey and Nohl. He shows that in his earliest stage Hegel shared the prevailing 'classicistic' attitude to the Greeks, but he also makes clear that if Hegel at that time had much in common with contemporary German leaders of classicistic thought, especially with Schiller, he nevertheless had his own, typically Hegelian ideas. This applies in particular to his interpretation and evaluation of Greek religion which he explained as an outgrowth and idealization of the realities of Greek life. He contrasted the secular and artistic qualities of Greek religion, its organic growth and development and affirmative attitude to life with the otherworldliness and transcendent nature of the Christian religion which seemed to him to have no relation to the political experiences of the people who confessed it but had been imposed upon them from the outside. At a later stage of his life Hegel came to appreciate the Christian phase of civilization as a necessary stage in the development of mankind beyond its brilliant pagan youth and found new symbols and formulas to describe the fundamental opposition between the Greek 'religion of beauty' and the spiritualized religion of the modern world. But even then his attitude to the Greeks shows a curious wavering between the recognition that Greek civilization was merely a stage, irrevocably past, in the evolution of the human spirit and, on the other hand, an intense admiration for the manifestations of the Greek mind. This admiration led him, for example, to devote in his *History of Philosophy* to the Greek philosophers a degree of attention out of all proportion to the importance which they would logically deserve in his scheme.

Mr. Gray shows convincingly how Hegel's interest in the individual thinkers is in large measure determined by what he regarded as anticipations of some of his own favorite ideas. He found such anticipations especially in Herakleitos (dialectic), Anaxagoras and Aristotle (creative mind= $\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ ). But they were not the only ones to engage his attention. His approach to Socrates has recently been made the subject of a study by Eduard Spranger. His interpretation of Plato's Parmenides still finds its champions. Aristotelian scholars who think that their philosopher knows what is a 'concept' have lately been accused of perpetuating a Hegelian misinterpretation. Mr. Gray minimizes Hegel's interest in the Neoplatonists. What about his scheme of thesis, antithesis, synthesis for which he has been thought to be in their debt?

In contrasting ancient 'ethos' with modern 'morality' Hegel instanced on the one side the ethical value attached to concrete allegiances, to custom, family and other social ties (cf. his famous interpretation of Sophocles' *Antigone*), on the other side the reliance on 'conscience' or on abstract, impersonal 'oughts' (like Kant's imperative). As for his fatal doctrines about the state,

they too have a source, though not their only source, in his study of the Greek polis.

The book is that of a philosopher who writes primarily for philosophers; but a classicist can hardly read a page of it without pausing to meditate and wonder. How many of Hegel's ideas about the Greeks have become generally accepted among us? How many have been accepted but modified? Not a few have, of course, been discarded. Some have recently been revived. Should not some others. . . ? But space is space, and this review can neither take up specific points which invite discussion nor convey an adequate impression of the richness of this fascinating book.

FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

**Apollonios Rhodios.** Interpretationen zur Erzählungskunst und Quellenerwertung. By FRANZ STOESSL. 158 pages. Haupt, Bern-Leipzig 1941 4.80 M.

These interpretations offer elaborate analyses of six episodes from the *Argonautica*, with findings about their sources, as follows: Chapter I (10-25) Cyzicus (*Argonautica* 1.936-1152), from a local history naming, with much aetiology, no less than eleven points connected with the legend; II (26-52) Lemnos (1.607-910), from the *Hypsipyle* of Aeschylus, which, because of the simple two-actor technique revealed by the reconstructed scenario, must be an early play; III (53-70) Jason's departure from Iolcos (1.1-518), mainly from the *Argo* of Aeschylus, the first play of a trilogy in which the *Hypsipyle* was the second; comparison of the two scenarios confirms the author's views on the structure of Aeschylean trilogy; IV (71-94) Phineus (*Argonautica* 2.178-499), from the *Phineus* of Aeschylus, with a revised scenario; V (95-126) Apsyrtus (*Argonautica* 4.303-521), from the *Scythae* of Sophocles (as Wilamowitz had guessed), with a scenario; VI (127-58) Medea on Corcyra (4.982-1227), from an otherwise unknown trilogy of Aeschylus, with scenarios of the second and third plays.

Notwithstanding the manifold attractions of the *Argonautica*, the poem as a whole is far from satisfactory. Details of the action are often obscure and sometimes irrational or inconsistent, while the tempo of the narrative is so uneven as to suggest a failure on the part of the poet to accommodate his materials to the framework of an epic. Unfortunately, most of these earlier versions are lost to us, though we can be sure that the poet-librarian of Alexandria was familiar with many literary treatments of the myth, in epic, lyric, and dramatic poetry, and in prose geography, logography, and local history.

Here, then, was a perfect situation for the exercise



of the so-called higher criticism. One should first devote his attention to the variations in the tempo. Obviously (to such a critic), where the narrative is compressed, with many localities and many actions crammed (as this critic well expresses it) "telegrammhaft" into a few lines, Apollonius has simply abridged a literary source, no doubt a local history. Where the action, confined to a few contiguous localities, is more leisurely, and especially when it is interrupted by speeches, he may be sure that Apollonius has followed another source, one in which a single episode of the tale had been given expanded treatment, i.e., a drama. Further, if one examines carefully the details of the action, he (if he be such a critic) can see that what is obscure and irrational in its present setting must be due to impatient abridgment or, perhaps, deliberate alteration of the source. Finally, if certain such dramatic episodes are selected, and the hints supplied by these "rudiments" are rationally interpreted by one acquainted with the technique of Attic tragedy, "whole scenarios can be recovered simply from the plot of Apollonius" (8).

Dr. Stoessel had already demonstrated his knowledge of Attic tragedy and applied his method of criticism in his *Die Trilogie des Aischylos: Formgesetz und Wege der Rekonstruktion* (reviewed in CLASSICAL WEEKLY 30[1936-7] 226-7). The present reviewer, who confesses his unfamiliarity with this method, can only record his amazement at the confidence with which the author explains, on the basis of an assumed source, many of the difficulties in the poem of Apollonius, and, at one and the same time, reconstructs the sources by resolving the difficulties. There is a kind of magic in the author's persuasiveness. Certainly there is magic, of a kind, in the assurance with which he creates for us a Hypsipyle in which Hypsipyle herself has rather a minor part in the action, or in the art by which he transforms the poet's words (1.648-9), "Why should I tell at length tales about Aethalides (μήθους Αἰθαλίδεω)?" The ordinary reader takes this as the poet's warning to himself not to digress further (after 640-8). Our author believes that Apollonius is warning the reader that in the dramatic source which he was following there were many more "words of Aethalides" than in the brief summary which he gives us (650-1).

Another reader, however, might come to a more sober conclusion with respect to the reconstructed scenarios, that, for all the talk about "controls" provided by the first episode studied, by the extant dramas of Aeschylus, and by the undoubtedly epic technique of Valerius Flaccus, which is dutifully compared for each episode, Stoessel's argument consists almost entirely of aesthetic judgments. One's judgments may not agree with his, but, of course, neither are susceptible of proof. All that can be claimed for the results of this method is that they may be plausible.

Nevertheless, this work, written as an "Habilitationsschrift" on the author's appointment as Privatdozent at the University of Zürich, is a notable contribution to the criticism of the Argonautica. Its minute analysis of these episodes contains penetrating and often illuminating comment on many obscurities, and its findings will be stimulating, at least, to future students. The author has made himself welcome not only to his colleagues at Zürich, but everywhere.

J. L. HELLER

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

**The Latinity of Dated Documents in the Portuguese Territory.** By NORMAN P. SACKS. ix, 179 pages. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 1941 (Publication of the Series in Romance Languages and Literatures, No. 32) \$2

This Pennsylvania dissertation is the latest in the valuable series of Portuguese studies being directed by Professor Edwin B. Williams.

The author's task has been to gather, from certain Latin documents, examples of phonological, morphological and syntactic phenomena which seem to indicate Romance, and especially Portuguese, developments. Those documents are described by the author (vi).

This study is concerned with published Latin documents (largely of a notarial nature) in Portuguese territory, covering the period A.D. 770 to 1192, the former date being that of the earliest published dated Latin document in Portugal found by the present writer, and the latter date, that of the first extant Portuguese document. The documents forming the basis of this study are to be found in the following collections: *The Portugaliae Monumenta Historica* (volumes *Diplomata et Chartae* and *Leges et Consuetudines*); Joao Ribeiro's *Dissertações Chronologicas e Criticas*; and the documents published by Pedro d'Azevedo in the *Revista Lusitana*, XIV, 251-259. The volumes of the *Arquivo Histórico Portuguez* were consulted but yielded nothing for this work.

Since it is my opinion that the author's method is not without some defects, it seems best to quote him further in that matter. Thus, in the text and in a footnote on page vi we find the following statements:

The criteria that have determined the number of examples cited are prevalence of the linguistic phenomenon in question and its chronological range. It should be noted that in cases where a Latin sound or form has suffered no change (e.g., *ū*, tonic *ī*) no entry for such sound or form has been made. Generally speaking, only *changes* have been recorded in this work. In general those changes which are very common to Vulgar Latin in all the Romance territory are not represented by so full a listing as those which are of special significance to Portuguese. In every case, the attempt has been made to give the earliest example of each linguistic change.

Dr. Sack's method of determining the number of examples cited may meet with the approval of many students, but it seems to me that "the prevalence of the linguistic phenomenon in question and its chronological

range" are rather subjective criteria. Furthermore, Sacks gives no evidence that he has attempted to list consecutive examples and to list (or at least to state the number of) the exceptions which might be found in the course of listing the consecutive positive examples. Thus he deprives himself and his readers of the important advantage of determining with some accuracy the relative frequency of the positive and exceptional phenomena. Also, it is evident that the stricter method I have suggested greatly simplifies the question of deciding how many positive examples of a given phenomenon are to be gathered, since almost any "reasonable" number would reveal the proportion of positive to negative data. Obviously, in those cases in which no exceptional examples are to be found, the student would merely have to indicate the amount of text which had to be read before the "reasonable" number of positive examples were found. It is true that in his "Concluding Remarks" (159-61) Sacks has about thirty statements of the following type: "The fall of intervocalic *d* (A.D. 944) appears quite commonly beginning with the middle of the tenth century and extending through the twelfth, with the greatest frequency in the eleventh." Such information is obviously valuable, but one cannot help asking why Sacks did not spend just a few additional hours in counting his cards so that we might know the actual numbers of occurrences.

In thus suggesting a stricter method which would obviously produce more significant results than those obtained by Sacks, I am well aware of the difficulties which that stricter method would involve, and I hasten to add that very few works of similar nature and scope, even works by the most mature and outstanding scholars throughout the history of linguistic studies, have consistently followed such a method. These criticisms, then, are presented from an idealistic point of view, as everyone who has had some amount of practical experience in linguistic research will realize. Therefore, there should be no danger that such criticisms will be taken too seriously by those who wish to appraise fairly this dissertation of Dr. Sacks.

What seems to me to be by far the most serious methodological defect of this dissertation is the author's very frequent and nonchalant identification of spelling and sound. Thus, when Sacks speaks of a change he almost always indicates merely a change of spelling. The fact that changes in spelling very often indicate changes in pronunciation and often indicate quite clearly the nature of those changes is a great blessing to Sacks, as it is to many another writer on phonology. Nevertheless, one cannot say that Sacks is completely unaware of the fact that spellings do not always give fairly accurate indications of sounds, because he sometimes (although very rarely) adds a phonetic symbol after a letter.

In the 58 pages devoted to phonology, Sacks' method

of procedure is to state a rule and then to present words, gathered from his Latin documents, which seem to bear out that rule. A reference is generally given to the corresponding phonological rule in Williams' *From Latin to Portuguese* and/or Grandgent's *Introduction to Vulgar Latin*. The data gathered by Sacks apparently do not always bear out the rule as stated by Williams, even in many cases in which the sound (or combination of sounds) involved has not undergone any change subsequent to the late Vulgar Latin or early Old Portuguese periods. Restricting ourselves to merely tonic vowels, we find a lack of agreement with respect to the rules of Sacks' §§ 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 12 and 13 and the corresponding rules in Williams. It seems that most of the differences in the two sets of rules are to be explained mainly by the fact that Sacks had a limited amount of data on the basis of which to formulate his rules, and also by the fact that Sacks makes no attempt to evaluate his spellings phonetically.

In §29, Sacks' rule is "*L. ae and oe > e*," and he gives such examples as *pena* < *poenam*, *preceptionem* < *praeceptionem*, and *sancte* < *sanctae*. Does he mean that this is a phonetic change or a change in spelling? Apparently he means that it is a phonetic change, because in the following rule (§29A) he says "Reverse spellings attest this change" and he gives such examples as *aeclesia* < *ecclesiam* and *foemina* < *feminam*. If he means, then, that his main rule indicates a phonetic change, why does he not attempt to explain the various phonetic values of that letter *e* in Vulgar Latin and Portuguese according to its sources and its various phonetic positions?

In §35, Sacks' rule is "*L. final ē fell when preceded by c, r, l, or n.*" Does he intend the "*L.*" to stand for Classic Latin or Vulgar Latin? Apparently he intends it to stand for Classic Latin, because of the sign, indicating shortness, over the *e*. But among his examples for this rule he includes *fer* < *ferit* in which there is no Classic Latin final *ē*.

The criticism presented in the preceding paragraph may seem to be trivial, and it may even seem to be unfair because it involves the dubious "problem" of "Vulgar Latin" and "Classic Latin." Nevertheless, the fact remains that if we wish to discuss the development of a Romance language, we must, at least in the present state of Romance linguistics, follow the traditional method of ascribing "reality" to "Vulgar Latin" and "Classic Latin" and of consistently taking either one or the other of those "languages" as a starting point for our historical descriptions and speculations. We must do this in spite of what is at least my own conviction, namely that "Classic Latin" and "Vulgar Latin" are merely two strata (fluctuating, undulating and frequently identified) of the same language. I have said that "Classic Latin" and "Vulgar Latin" are merely two strata. I am aware that even such a definition in-



words, to bear to the From uction appar- ed by and (or ergone tin or ves to t with and 13 s that are to a lim- nulate es no and he em < mean elling? e, be- verse mples If he netic arious a and arious

volves a concession to the practical need of simplifying our discussions because it seems to me that if (again for practical purposes) we assume "Classic Latin" to be "written Latin" (i.e. literary Latin) and if we assume "Vulgar Latin" to be "spoken Latin," then "Classic Latin" had as many strata as the number of people who wrote it, and "Vulgar Latin" had as many strata as the number of people who spoke it. Furthermore, to add one more complexity, however dubious, everyone who spoke and/or wrote Latin did so in a different manner every succeeding day of his life.

In § 38, Sacks presents the following rule: "Intervocalic  $b > c$  or  $ch$  in *mibi* and *nihil*." The examples cited are *micchi*, *mici*, *nichil* and *nicil*. Since a reference is given to Grandgent's statement of the "school pronunciation of medial  $b$  as  $k$ ," Sacks must be aware that he is dealing with a phonetic change. Why, then, does he not say that medial  $b > k$ , spelled  $c$  or  $ch$ , if he accepts Grandgent's view of the matter? In a footnote to the rule Sacks writes: "The forms *mizi* (Dip, 172, A.D. 1033) and *nizil* (Dip, 233 A.D. 1052) are of purely orthographic, not phonological significance. Cf. Ptg. *aniquilar*." Since he goes out of his way to make such a comment, are we to infer that his main rules all have phonological significance? If so, why does he not discuss their phonological significance, instead of regularly presenting the rules merely in terms of spelling? Evidences of similar confusion occur throughout the dissertation, particularly in the section dealing with consonants.

Concerning the unexplained instances of the medial letter  $z$  ("purely orthographic" according to Sacks) in the above examples, I think that we must consider the possibility (even the probability) that that letter represented a sound which was to indicate merely a slight closing and a voicing of the original  $[ç]$  or front variety of  $[x]$  which probably were the early sounds corresponding to the Latin letter  $h$  before a front vowel. Portuguese *aniquilar* in which the *qu* stands for a front variety of  $[k]$  does not prove that the  $z$  spelling could not have stood for this. However, it must be admitted that Sacks' reasoning in this matter is the same as that commonly used by phonologists. Rather than give a detailed explanation of my own views in this matter, I shall merely state that those views are in accord with my theory (of trial and error in linguistic change) which I have published elsewhere.

In general Sacks does not consistently treat consonant groups with regard to their position and surrounding sounds. This lack of careful analysis, plus Sacks' confusion of letters and sounds, occasionally leads to vagueness (as in § 56). Since the rule and examples are given usually without phonological comment, it is evident that the material as presented offers us very little precise information by either a phonological or an orthographic approach.

As further evidence of some confusion in the arrangement and general handling of his material, we may note the following: Rule 74, under liquids, is " $pl > pr$ ," and the examples include both  $pl$  in the medial group *mpl* and initial  $pl$ ; Rule 75, under liquids, is " $pl > br$ ," and the two examples are of medial  $pl$ ; Rule 90, under labials, is "Initial  $pl > ch$  in *chagado* < *plagatum* and *chegar* < *plica(ve)rit*" (no mention being made of the fact that the letters  $ch$  stood for  $[tʃ]$  or  $[ʃ]$ ); Rule 90 A, under labials, is "In *xegar* < *plica(ve)rit*, the  $x$  doubtless had the value of  $[tʃ]$  or  $[ʃ]$ "; and Rule 91, under labials, is "Medial  $pl > bl$ ." Why some of the rules for  $pl$  are listed under liquids and others are listed under labials, we do not know.

Sacks' chapters on morphology (59-84) and syntax (85-158) seem to make up his best contribution, since the data he is examining are more clearly indicated by spellings than are the data of phonology. The only general (although very minor) criticism which might be made of these chapters is that Sacks frequently seems to act in a manner contrary to his statement (vi) that "in general, those changes which are very common to Vulgar Latin in all the Romance territory are not represented by so full a listing as those which are of special significance to Portuguese." Thus, in spite of Sacks' statement, such common General Romance phenomena as the following have rather extensive listings: § 166, "The genitive case was often replaced by the nominative or an oblique case, usually with the preposition *de*, and sometimes with *in*" (five pages of examples); § 167, "The dative case was frequently replaced by *ad* with the nominative or an oblique case form. The dative form, when used, was often reinforced by *ad*" (six pages); § 168, "The accusative function is often expressed by a nominative or oblique case other than the accusative. After prepositions, it is frequently expressed by the ablative" (seven and a half pages); § 169, "The ablative is frequently replaced by another oblique case, particularly the accusative, with prepositions. Sometimes the ablative is used with a superfluous preposition" (ten pages).

However, even in the chapters on morphology and syntax, the failure clearly to distinguish spellings and sounds is responsible for some statements which might be more clearly expressed otherwise. Thus, in a footnote to the rule in § 162 A ("*Ad* is commonly found for *ab*") Sacks says "The use of *ad* for *ab* is probably due to the fall of final  $d$  and  $b$ . *Ad*, thus, is a false regression." In terms of spelling, Sacks' statement is obviously correct, but if he is talking in terms of phonetics, as he sometimes does, there is obviously no "false regression," since the two words had become identical phonetically.

In § 162 E, Sacks gives the rule "The preposition *de* is used with *ex*," and gives examples such as *aliquis homo de parte mea uel de ex heredibus meis*. He then

adds the statement "This combination of *de* and *ex* yields the Portuguese *des*, which appears in the following citations . . ." He then gives examples such as *des ille ribulo*. It seems to me that Sacks might well have mentioned the fact that *de ex* was possibly pronounced the same as *des*, especially since *des* is sometimes found earlier than *de ex* in the same series of documents.

In § 119, he states his findings as follows:

There are some nouns which exhibit forms of the declension to which they belonged in Classical Latin and other forms of a different declension. These non-Classical Latin forms are doubtless due to assimilation to the ending of the preceding or following noun or adjective and should not be regarded as indicative of a shift of declension.

As illustrative of these remarks, he cites examples such as *parentorum* in the expression *de parentorum nostrorum*. The possibility of the validity of the explanation proposed by Sacks (to whom that explanation was suggested by Carnoy's explanation of similar examples) should not exclude the possibility and probability of other "causes," such as general assimilation (however hesitant and inconsistent the process might be) to another declension. Such a general assimilation to another declension (like, indeed, the type of assimilation suggested by Sacks) would be a manifestation of the urge toward simplification (conservation of energy) which, according to my theory of linguistic change, is constantly active (subconsciously, by trial and error, and in all languages) in opposition to the urge toward (the need for) clarity (effectiveness). Sacks' argument is weakened, as he himself recognizes, by the fact that he finds frequent examples of *parentum* (not *parentorum*) followed by *nostrorum*, *meorum* and *avium*.

At the end of his "Concluding Remarks" (161), Sacks makes the following comment: "The tendency

toward more correct Latinity in the twelfth century may be due to certain educational reforms (Cf. the discontinued appearance of Romance phenomena in the Latin notarial documents of Spain in the eleventh century, because of the Cluniac reforms)." A footnote to this comment refers us to Menéndez Pidal's *Orígenes* (vi) where the influence of the Cluniac reforms in Spain is indicated.

Sacks' final statement is as follows:

Most of the phenomena peculiar to the Portuguese language made their appearance by the end of the eleventh century. Although the earliest Portuguese document known is of the year 1192, the present study affords evidence of the existence of Portuguese as a separate language at least one hundred years earlier.

There may be some people who will consider it important to dispute about the "existence of Portuguese as a separate language at least one hundred years earlier," and who will bring up for debate the question of why and when Portuguese should be so called. As for myself, I should be willing to call Modern Portuguese the Modern Vulgar Latin of Portugal if the latter name were not so long, and I think that nothing (except a little time and energy) would be lost by so doing.

At the end of his dissertation, Sacks includes a list of about 500 words under the heading "Appendix I: Portuguese words found in documents studied and earliest date of occurrence of each word." In this heading it is evident that the expression "Portuguese words" must be changed to "words spelled like Portuguese words." Nevertheless, these data are of great value to linguists, and more than ordinary praise must be given to the student whose labors have made that list possible.

HARRY A. DEFERRARI

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

#### ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

This department is conducted by Dr. Charles T. Murphy of Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. Correspondence concerning abstracts may be addressed to him.

Microfilm or photostat copies of articles abstracted may be obtained through Bibliofilm Service, Department of Agriculture Library, Washington, D. C. The charge for a microfilm copy of any periodical article, regardless of length, is 50c; film copying from books and serials is at the rate of 50c for each 50 pages or fraction thereof. Photostat charges are 10c per page, with a minimum charge of 50c for each item. The Service reserves the right to except material readily available elsewhere.

#### ANCIENT AUTHORS

**Cicero.** H. Box. *Cicero, in Verrem, i.30*. "The passage seems to prove . . . that a *decuria* was formed for each trial as it came on for hearing."  
CR 56 (1942) 72 (F. Jones)

— G. M. TUCKER. *Cicero, Pro Sestio 72*. A suggestion that Cicero wrote *Dentatum* instead of *Gracchum*, which has no point in this passage. The reading could have been lost by haplography (sc. *irridentatum*); a corrector, restoring *irridentes*, then replaced the meaningless *atum* with *Gracchum* from 82.  
CR 56 (1942) 68-9 (F. Jones)

**Theocritus.** A. S. F. Gow. *The Twenty-Second Idyll of Theocritus*. It is the general impression that the Hymn to the Dioscuri is not a very satisfactory poem, but no attempt has been made to envisage the problem which it presents. The Idyll falls into four parts: (1) Prelude to the Dioscuri (1-26), an Alexandrian version of the 33rd Homeric Hymn, (2) Polydeukes and Amykos (27-134), the boxing match, (3) Kastor and Lynkeus (137-211), the fight in which Kastor kills Lynkeus, (4) Epilogue (212-223). Careful consideration of these parts as to style, content and purpose shows that parts (1) and (2) are polished work, strangely contrasted with the slovenly performance of parts (3) and (4). The obvious inference is that the poem was not composed as a whole, but put together from components of which some were of independent origin. Thus, it is suggested, part (1) is Theocritus' version, in the Alexandrian idiom, of the Homeric Hymn to the Dioscuri; part (2) is his demonstration of how Apollonius should have written Argon. 2.1-97; part (3) is a weak and poorly-conceived attempt to parallel for Kastor the *ἀπυρρέα* of Polydeukes in part (2); and part (4) confirms the hasty and careless construction of Idyll 22

upon the basis of parts (1) and (2).  
CR 56 (1942) 11-8

(Armstrong)

M. PLATNAUER. *Theocritea*. (1) A proposal to reinstate the old reading *Κρανίδων* (Tr<sup>2</sup>X, *editio princeps*, and all editions up to and including that of Ahrens) in 1.22 for Wilamowitz's *κρανίδων*. (2) In 1.56, *θάγμα* is doubtless the right reading, but Legrand is wrong in following Wilamowitz by citing *A.P.* 9.101 in support. There is no trace of *θάγμα* in Stadtmüller's apparatus; the reading is *μήνυμα*. (3) *ὑπόμαξον* in 2.59 and *πάσσω* in 2.62 cannot both stand, since sympathetic magic demands that the action really performed and that performed in intention should be expressed by the same verb. All suggested emendations (e.g. *μάσσω*, *ὑπόπασον*) are unsatisfactory, hence the proposal is made to read *ὑπόπαξον*, for which a linguistic argument is submitted. (4) A proposal to read *τὸ δ' αὐτῷ* (or *αὐτῷ*) for *οὐδ' αὐτῷ* in 30.21,22, which heals the sense and affords a satisfactory explanation for a puzzling passage.

CR 56 (1942) 9-10

(Armstrong)

VERGIL, H. MATTINGLY. *Notes on Virgil*. (1) *Caesar in the First Georgic*. One minor difficulty of the passage of invocation to Caesar at the beginning of Georg. I—namely, why is the curious suggestion that Tartarus might be the realm of the divine Caesar (1.36ff.) put forward at all, as it is only to be rejected?—is met by the fact that the *gens Iulia* had at Bovillae a special cult of the god Vejovis, who was definitely chthonic in character. The major problem remains: who is Caesar here, and what is the meaning of the invocation? Virgil's language clearly shows that it is Julius, definitely recognized as a god after the triumph of the Caesarian faction, but not yet designated to a fixed place of worship. This leads to the suggestion of an earlier date for the first Georgic than has usually been assigned to it. Towards the close of the book, lines 466, 489ff., 498ff., and especially 509-511, indicate a very early date, not long after Philippi, when Octavian returned to settle the soldiers on the Italian lands. (2) *Diana-Bellona*. If Diana is perfectly suited to be the patron goddess of the young huntress Camilla (Aen. 7.903ff. and 11.532ff.), is it natural that Camilla as *bellatrix* (7.805) should also come under her protection, or, rather, that of Bellona? The simple solution of the difficulty lies in the fact, hitherto obscured by a confusion of names, that Bellona is simply Diana in her function of war-goddess.

CR 56 (1942) 18-20

(Armstrong)

LITERARY HISTORY. CRITICISM

KRAPPE, ALEXANDER H. *The Land of Darkness*. The author of the *Chanson de Roland* evidently derived his notion of a Land of Darkness (vv. 979-83) from Byzantine sources. Such a region is mentioned in the Alexander romances, in the *Argonautica*, in the *Odyssey*, and in numerous Moslem writings. Its earliest localization seems to have been the Tigris tunnel, beyond which the Terrestrial Paradise was thought to lie. Once the nature of the tunnel was understood, however, "the Land of Darkness was pushed farther north, to be identified, in the end, with the extreme northern and northeastern parts of European and Asiatic Russia, where the disappearance of the sun for entire months was bound to lend color to the identification."

PhQ 21 (1942) 334-46

(P. F. Jones)

LE COMTE, EDWARD S. *New Light on the "Haemony" Passage in Comus*. The name and characteristic given by Milton to the saving plant "haemony" (*Comus* 629-41) may represent the combined influence of the following sources: descriptions of the plant moly in the *Odyssey* (10.302-6), in the *Metamorphoses* (14.291-2), and in Pliny's *Naturalis Historia* (25.4, 8); *Haemonia* as a name for Thessaly, the land of magic; Eustathius' *Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*; John Fletcher's *Faithful Shepherdess*; John Gerard's *Herball* or *General Historie of Plantes* (1633 edition); Theocritus' *Fourth Idyll* (57-8); and *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville*.

PhQ 21 (1942) 283-98

(P. F. Jones)

PHILOSOPHY. RELIGION. SCIENCE

KOLBE, WALTHER. *Zwei Grundtatsachen der Attischen und Delphischen Chronologie*. Ferguson's discovery that the clerk of the Athenian Council was usually appointed with reference to the official succession of the Phylae has commonly been regarded of decisive help in arranging the Attic archons for 293/2. For this year no list has come down. Nevertheless Ferguson's principle must not be followed slavishly to the extent of falsifying the historical picture. Exception is taken to Ferguson's reckoning in his *Tribal Cycles* of the period from 230/29 to 201/0. A firmer chronological basis is found in the penteteric festival of *Leucophryena*, in which Athens agreed to participate in 205/4. Additional support is found for the author's chronology in the history of Smyrna, which was accepted by Delphi as a city of asylum, 246.

H 75 (1940) 397-409

(Kirk)

MESSINGER, RUTH ELLIS. *Christian Hymns of the First Three Centuries*. Presents the extant sources for early hymns, which were largely of the psalm type. "... the futile attempt to differentiate among psalms, hymns and canticles should be avoided." These sources were: (1) Old Testament hymns; (2) New Testament hymns (canticles); (3) Liturgical hymns; (4) Contemporary Pagan hymns and Heretical hymns; the influence of Classical sources on early Christian hymnology is almost non-existent. The few early extant hymns are discussed.

Papers of the Hymn Society 9 (1942) 1-27 (C.T.M.)

QUASTEN, JOHANNES. *The Liturgical Singing of Women in Christian Antiquity*. Various causes furnished the grounds in different localities for the prohibition of the singing of women in church. The opposition to the singing of women in divine Christian worship did not begin until the end of the second century of the Christian era. Too localized and insufficiently uniform to have had for its grounds the participation of women in heathen worship, the exclusion of female singing was initiated by certain opponents of the heretics when it became the practice in heretical circles to establish choirs of women, separated from the congregation, to conduct the singing at divine worship. With the cessation of community singing in church the prohibition became universal.

CHR 27 (1941) 1-19

(Panetta)

ART. ARCHAEOLOGY

HAUSER, WALTER and WILKINSON, CHARLES K. *The Museum's Excavations at Nishāpūr*. The Iranian expedition, consisting of Joseph M. Upton and the authors, reports two more seasons' work at Nishāpūr—the first from July until December 1938 and the second from July 1939 until August 1940. The program was so arranged that when spreading hostilities brought the work



to a close few loose ends remained. All stored material and excavations had been so noted, photographed, and planned as to minimize the difficulties of resumption of work on the site. Half of the finds were at once shipped to New York, and all notes, plans and photographs were brought home, although duplicates were left behind. The excavation of Teppéh Madraseh, begun in 1938, yielded from a mound called Kanât Teppéh a round tower, a small mosque, a bath house and the débris from several kilns. The mosque, originally built in the early ninth century, was destroyed and rebuilt on the same plan at least once. It is a simple, rectangular room with prayer niches typical of all those found at Nishâpûr.

The bath was badly ruined. The remains were sufficient, however, to show that the arrangement was similar to that of a modern Turkish bath, with a rectangular reception room, an octagonal room with a nine-sided basin surrounded by individual cubicles, and a hot room with an oval pool heated by two furnaces. The walls and floor of all rooms where water was used were entirely covered with a hard, water-resisting plaster. Blocks of painted plaster, discovered on the site, show that the walls were decorated with pictures in bright, cheerful colors. The problem of studying the fragments recovered from the layers of broken plaster has been left for the future since the fragments themselves are composed of layers cemented together by dampness and salt. It will be necessary either to devise some way to separate them or to copy each layer and destroy it in laying bare the next.

The débris from one of the three destroyed kilns yielded a quantity of partially spoiled glass ingots, proving what was hitherto suspected, that glass was made at Nishâpûr. At the second kiln wasters of the T'ang type glazed pottery were found and at the third a quantity of wasters of thick, heavy, greenish pottery bottles. These were apparently containers for volatile or expensive liquids such as rose water.

Kanât Teppéh also yielded a beautiful tenth-century bowl with thin, beautifully turned walls and high foot-rings in fine-grained pottery. The ornamentation consists of a simple design in bright red and black on a white background.

Teppéh Madraseh proved rich in information and material, the most important finds consisting of the remains of a large barrel-vaulted mosque and the broken walls of a complex group of buildings, presumably a palace or series of government or public buildings. The mosque, which was destroyed, repaired, altered, and rebuilt in rapid succession, dates from the ninth century, which is represented only by the lower part of the walls. To the tenth century belongs the court provided by walling off a space in front of the archway. In the eleventh century bands of carved brick ornamentation were added to the mosque itself.

The ornamentation of the mosque affords a series of datable decorations which permit us to follow the evolution of Islamic art throughout three centuries.

The remains of the palace buildings show two main periods of construction. They were begun in the early ninth century and altered in the tenth, when the detached buildings arranged around a square were joined by one long arcade. From the residential section of the palace were unearthed plaster carvings, wall paintings and the remains of a brightly painted dado with a design suggesting matched marbles. Also in the palace were a number of *mirâbs* or prayer niches.

Among objects found were clay models or matrices, an incomplete blue glass dish, a carafe and a jug of

clear cut glass, a silver gilt amulet case, and an assortment of ninth- and tenth-century glazed pottery representing two new types.

BMM 37 (1942) 83-119

(Panetta)

#### HISTORY. SOCIAL STUDIES

GIFFLER, MILTON. *Artemisios and Gerastios in the Spartan Calendar*. There is in Thucydides a correlation of the dates of the truce of 423 and the peace of Nicias in 421 within the Spartan and Athenian calendars. This has permanently enmeshed the relationship of the Spartan months with the problem of the resolution of the Athenian year 422/1 B.C. as ordinary or intercalary. 424/3 Athenian Elaphebolion 14 equals Spartan Gerastios 12, and 422/1 Athenian Elaphebolion 24/5 equals Spartan Artemisios 26/7. Gerastios probably precedes Artemisios and corresponds to the Athenian Anthesterion. One possibility is that there were intercalations in the Spartan calendar during the two ordinary Athenian years which preceded the truce and likewise in the two following years. This, however, is far less likely than the alternate possibility that the Athenian year 422/1 was intercalary and the others ordinary.

H 75 (190) 215-26

(Kirk)

INSTINSKY, HANS ULRICH. *Consensus Universorum*. The phrase, per consensum universorum potius rerum omnium (Monumentum Ancyranum 34), is reinterpreted as referring to the time after the battle of Actium. Evidence from inscriptions and from literary sources (especially Suetonius, Tacitus and Pliny the Younger) shows that the consensus universorum had a more serious import politically than it had in the social or political life of pre-Augustan times. Appeal was made to it most commonly when the imperial succession was disputed, and the consensus thus implied a harmony between ruler and subjects. Associated therewith was a religious connotation and some of the moral fervor contained in Cicero's program of the consensus omnium bonorum (Res gestae, p. 146f.). Augustan usage reflects the unanimous feeling shared by Senate and People alike after Actium that the victor was the savior of the state and its chosen leader.

H 75 (1940) 265-78

(Kirk)

KOLBE, WALTHER. *Die Vierjährigen Soterien der Aitolier*. The festival of the Soteria, which was instituted to commemorate the victory over the Celts at Delphi, was celebrated under the presidency of the Aetolians every four years independently of the Pythian festival and in a non-Pythian year. The Sotion inscription, an invitation to the Soteria which Sotion brought to the Alexandrians in the ninth year of Ptolemy Philopator (213-212 B.C.), shows that the festival fell in the fall of the year 212 and ran parallel to the Olympia.

H 75 (1940) 54-63

(Kirk)

QUASTEN, JOHANNES. *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Exorcism of the Cilicium*. Standing on sackcloth, the so-called rite of the Cilicium, known from the baptismal ceremonies of the Church in Africa and Spain, is to be found earliest in the church of Antioch. A pagan parallel is offered by the *Dios Kodion*, used in Greece in rites of purification. The Cilicium symbolizes sin and death (which in the rite is trampled under foot); similarly sackcloth, and everything made of animal skins was banned from pagan temples, as reminders of death.

HTHR 35 (1942) 209-19

(Walton)